

RESPONSE

This is a response to the Final Office Action dated February 15, 2005. Claims 1-42 are pending in the application. In the Final Office Action, the Examiner objected to various informalities and typographic errors in the specification. -The examiner rejected claims 1, 2, 4, 13-18, 20, 23-25, 29, 31-33, 36-38, 40 and 42 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Pat. No. 5,859,596 ("McRae"). Claims 3, 5-12, 19, 21, 22, 26-28, 30, 34, 35, 39 and 41 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over: McRae in view of U.S. Pat. No. 5,453,903 ("Chow"); McRae in view of "Global Positioning System Applications at the Bonneville Power Administration" ("Street"); McRae in view of Street and further in view of U.S. Pat. No. 5,809,045 ("Adamiak"); McRae in view of Applicant's Admissions of the prior art; McRae in view of U.S. Pat. No. 5,768,148 ("Murphy"); McRae in view of Multichannel Continuous Harmonic Analysis in Real-Time ("Miller"); McRae in view of U.S. Pat. No. 4,717,985 ("Demeyer"); McRae in view of U.S. Pat. No. 6,369,719 ("Tracy") or McRae in view of Adamiak.

The rejections from the Final Office Action of February 15, 2005 are discussed below in connection with the various claims. No new matter has been added. Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested in light of the following remarks.

I. DRAWING OBJECTIONS

The Examiner objected to the drawings as containing various informalities. With this response, appropriate corrections have been made. No new matter has been added. In particular, the following corrections have been made:

1. Figures 1-30b have been amended to delete the sheet numbering of each Figure; and
2. Figure 30A had been inadvertently labeled as Figure 23A, so Figure 23A has been renamed as Figure 30A. Figures 1-30b were originally replaced because the Preliminary Amendment, dated May 28, 2004, failed to identify each figure as a "Replacement Sheet." The sheet numbering on Figures 1-30b has now been removed because Figures 31a-46i were not numbered. Figures 31a-

46i were incorporated by reference from the parent application, U.S. Patent No. 6,694,270 and were properly entered in the Preliminary Amendment dated May 28, 2004.

II. SPECIFICATION OBJECTIONS

The Examiner objected to the specification as containing various informalities and typographic errors. With this response, a substitute specification has been provided which corrects all of the errors noted by the Examiner. No new matter has been added. A marked up version of the substitute specification has not been provided because the changes were only formatting changes to tables within the specification.

Paragraph 6 of the prior office action and paragraph 3 of the current office action state that the listing of references in the specification is not a proper information disclosure statement. However, the references listed in the specification were not intended to be information disclosures and are merely used as examples of what is commonly known in the art. Further, certain of these references were listed in a proper Information Disclosure Statement filed on July 3, 2003.

In particular, the following corrections have been made:

1. On pages 28-48, 50-68 and 71 the tables have been revised so that the spacing between all lines of each table is 1.5 lines.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw these objections to the Specification.

III. REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102

Independent claim 1 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by McRae. Applicant submits that McRae does not anticipate claim 1 for the reasons that McRae does not disclose all of the elements of claim 1.

Claim 1 relates to devices “for monitoring and reporting at least one parameter of an electric circuit.” “A sensor coupled with said electric circuit” senses “at least one electrical parameter in said electric circuit and generate[s] at least one analog signal indicative thereof.” “An analog to digital converter” operates “to convert at least one analog signal to

at least one digital signal.” “A processor coupled with said analog to digital convertor” generates “at least one computed value from said at least one digital signal.” “A local display coupled with said processor” reports “said at least one computed value.” “A communications port coupled with said processor and a digital network” allows “reporting of said at least one computed value onto said digital network.” Finally, “a summing module coupled with said digital network” receives “said at least one computed value from said first device digital network and receive at least one second value from a second device, wherein said summing module is further operative to sum said at least one computed value and said second value to at least one third value”

McRae discloses “a plurality of monitoring devices...connected to respective pieces of switchyard equipment and associated with a common communications network. A remote host computer is connected to the network to bidirectionally communicate with each monitoring device. The communications network is the existing power line used for delivering power and control signals to the switchyard equipment. Each monitoring device includes testing and/or monitoring circuitry for testing and/or monitoring one or more conditions of the piece of switchyard equipment and generating condition data therefrom, a storage device for storing the generated data, and a transmitter adapted to transmit the data to the remote location via the power line. The remote host computer receives the data transmitted to the remote location and stores the received data therein in a database format. The monitoring device can request previously sent data from the remote host computer. The monitoring includes an RS-232 port for accepting a local computer which conducts tests of the switchyard equipment, analyzes the results, compares the results with previous tests, and reprograms alarm parameters and baseline values associated with the switchyard equipment.” McRae, Abstract.

McRae fails to disclose a summing module coupled with a digital network operative to receive values from two devices and compute a third value based on the values from first and second devices, as claimed in claim 1. McRae discloses, instead, “a monitoring device that computes and stores averaged values of temperature and pressure, and the accumulated amp-hours for each phase...” McRae, col. 11 lines 57-60. This is merely a summation within a monitoring device of values from that monitoring device. McRae does not disclose

a summing module that sums values from separate devices, nor does it disclose a system in which a summing module is connected to a network that is further connected to other monitoring devices to receive values from those devices. McRae merely discloses that the monitoring devices do their own summation and that the devices themselves are coupled to a communications network to receive and compute values. See McRae, Abstract. Claim 1 not only includes monitoring devices coupled to a network, but also a summing module coupled to the network where the summing module receives values from multiple devices via the network and sums values from those multiple devices. This distinguishes McRae because Claim 1 discloses summation of values from multiple devices, not merely a summation of values from a single device.

For at least these reasons, McRae does not anticipate independent claim 1.

Accordingly, Applicant requests that the Examiner withdraw this rejection of Claim 1.

Dependent claims 2, 4, 13-18, 20, 23-25, 29, 31-33, 36-38, 40 and 42 were also rejected pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by McRae. Dependent claims 2, 4, 13-18, 20, 23-25, 29, 31-33, 36-38, 40 and 42 should be allowed for the reasons set out above for the independent claims. Applicant therefore requests that the Examiner withdraw this rejection of these claims.

IV. REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

A. McRae in view of Chow, Street or Street further in view of Adamiak

Dependent claims 3 and 5-12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over McRae in view of Chow, Street or Street, further in view of Adamiak. These claims should be allowed for the reasons set forth above for the independent claim. Neither McRae, Chow, Street or Adamiak, alone or in combination, disclose all of the limitations of the independent claim from which claims 3 and 5-12 depend. In particular, McRae fails to disclose a summing module coupled to the digital network for receiving two values from two devices and summing the values, as claimed in claim 1 discussed above, and neither Chow, Street nor Adamiak disclose such a summing module. Accordingly, Applicants request that the Examiner withdraw these rejections of dependent claims 3 and 5-12.

B. McRae in view of Applicant's Admissions of prior art

Dependent claims 19, 30, 34 and 35 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over McRae in view of Applicant's admissions of the prior art. These claims should be allowed for the reasons set forth above for the independent claim. Applicants submit that neither McRae nor the Applicant's admissions of prior art, alone or in combination disclose all of the limitations of the independent claim from which claims 21, 22 or 26-28 depend. In particular, McRae fails to disclose a summing module coupled to the digital network for receiving two values from two devices and summing the values, as claimed in claim 1 discussed above, and Applicant's Admissions of the prior art do not disclose such a summing module. Accordingly, Applicants request that the Examiner withdraw these rejections of dependent claims 19, 30, 34 and 35.

C. McRae in view of Murphy, Miller or Demeyer

Dependent claims 21, 22 or 26-28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over McRae in view of Murphy, Miller or Demeyer. These claims should be allowed for the reasons set forth above for the independent claim. Neither McRae, Murphy, Miller or Demeyer, alone or in combination, disclose all of the limitations of the independent claim from which claims 21, 22 or 26-28 depend. In particular, McRae fails to disclose a summing module coupled to the digital network for receiving two values from two devices and summing the values, as claimed in claim 1 discussed above, and neither Murphy, Miller nor Demeyer disclose such a summing module. Accordingly, Applicants request that the Examiner withdraw these rejections of dependent claims 21, 22 and 26-28.

D. McRae in view of Tracy

Dependent claim 39 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over McRae in view of Tracy. This claim should be allowed for the reasons set forth above for the independent claim. Neither McRae or Tracy, alone or in combination, disclose all of the limitations of the independent claim from which claim 39 depends. In particular, McRae fails to disclose a summing module coupled to the digital network for receiving two values

from two devices and summing the values, as claimed in claim 1 discussed above, and Tracy does not disclose such a summing module. Accordingly, Applicants request that the Examiner withdraw these rejections of dependent claim 39.

E. McRae in view of Adamiak

Dependent claim 41 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over McRae in view of Adamiak. This claim should be allowed for the reasons set forth above for the independent claim. Neither McRae nor Adamiak, alone or in combination, disclose all of the limitations of the independent claim from which claim 41 depends. In particular, McRae fails to disclose a summing module coupled to the digital network for receiving two values from two devices and summing the values, as claimed in claim 1 discussed above, and Adamiak does not disclose such a summing module. Accordingly, Applicants request that the Examiner withdraw these rejections of dependent claim 41.

CONCLUSION

Each of the rejections in the Final Office Action dated February 15, 2005, has been addressed and no new matter has been added. Applicants submit that all of the pending claims are in condition for allowance and notice to this effect is respectfully requested. The Examiner is invited to call the undersigned if it would expedite the prosecution of this application.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Scott Timmerman". The signature is written in dark ink and is positioned above a horizontal line.

Scott A. Timmerman
Registration No. 55,678

Attorney for Applicants

BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE
P.O. BOX 10395
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS 60610
(312) 321-4200